PATTERNS OF POWER · THE FLOOR AND THE ROBE

# The Ledger of Fictions

## *How the United States Wrote a Continental Theft into Law, and What It Told the Public While It Did So*

*A forensic ledger of the fictions by which a continental theft was written into law — each instrument's exact words set against the floor beneath it, and the audience it was cut for.*

◆

A ROBE-ANALYSIS IN THE PATTERNS OF POWER SERIES

# How to Read This Ledger

This is not a history of Indigenous dispossession. It is a forensic reconstruction of the *instruments* — the specific legal and narrative fictions through which the United States converted armed seizure into lawful acquisition — read in the exact words of the documents themselves. The wording is the subject, not the decoration on top of it. When a Chief Justice writes that "discovery gave title," he is not describing a fact in the world; he is minting a currency. When an editor writes that a continent was "allotted by Providence," the passive voice is doing load-bearing work, because it erases the actor. In a case like this the words *are* the mechanism, because the men at the apex will reach for exactly those words, again and again, for a century and more, whenever they need the theft to hold.

Each instrument in the ledger is read along four lines, kept deliberately close together so the reader assembles the pattern rather than being told it:

- **The exact words** — the operative phrase, quoted precisely and set apart as an exhibit.
- **What the words did** — the specific legal or rhetorical work the fiction performed: what right it extinguished, what act it licensed.
- **The floor beneath** — what was actually happening on the ground at that moment, in figures where the record allows them.
- **The audience** — because a legitimating claim is never manufactured from nothing. It is always a claim on some authority the audience receiving it already agrees to honour, and a single apparatus frequently ran more than one such claim at once, cut differently for different audiences who were never in the room together to compare them.

Two tracks run through the whole ledger, and the gap between them is its single most important feature. The first is the record of what was done — a

legal, military, and administrative project of dispossession at continental scale. The second is the record of what the domestic public was told about it — civilisation, progress, benevolence, the fulfilment of a divine plan. These are not two versions of one story of equal weight. They are two structurally incompatible accounts of the same events, produced simultaneously by the same governing apparatus for different audiences. Placing them on the same line is the analytical act this ledger performs.

One diagnostic governs the reading throughout. Organised force never pays for what it does not need. Wherever an apparatus that already held uncontested military power over a population nonetheless spent something real and avoidable to acquire a *legal* form for what it was doing — negotiated a treaty it could have simply ignored, argued a case it could have declined to hear, wrote a "solemn guarantee" it had no material compulsion to write — that expenditure is the evidence that the legal form was actually necessary to some audience whose compliance mattered. The United States held the guns. It bought the paper anyway. The ledger is a record of why.

# The Empty-Land Fiction

*John Winthrop, General Considerations for the Plantation in New England (1629)*

The doctrine that would run for four centuries was already fully formed in a private paper an English lawyer wrote to talk himself and his associates into a voyage, more than a century and a half before there was a United States to inherit it. Winthrop poses the objection to himself directly — by what right does one take land already held — and answers it:

> "What warrant have we to take that land, which is and hath been of long tyme possessed of others the sons of Adam? Ans. That which is common to all is proper to none. This savage people ruleth over many lands without title or property; for they inclose no ground, neither have they cattell to maintayne it, but remove their dwellings as they have occasion, or as they can prevail against their neighbours."

**What the words did.** They performed a legal conversion disguised as an observation. Winthrop did not deny that people lived on the land; he denied that the way they lived on it produced *ownership* an English court would recognise. He drew the distinction that the entire subsequent apparatus would rest on — between a "naturall right" that any occupant might hold and a "civil right" created only by enclosure and improvement:

> "For God hath given to the sons of men a twofold right to the earth; there is a naturall right and a civill right. The first right was naturall when men held the earth in common… and this in time got them a civill right."

Hunting and shifting cultivation, in this scheme, produced the first kind of right and never the second. The land was therefore, in the phrase the

doctrine would carry, *vacuum domicilium* — legally vacant regardless of who was standing on it. The inhabitants were present; their presence simply did not count.

**The floor beneath.** The land was not vacant and Winthrop knew it — his own text elsewhere concedes the natives had "manured" ground for their corn, which he proposed to leave them while taking "the rest." What made the taking practical was not the argument but the epidemics of 1616–1619, which had killed a very large share of the coastal population of New England before the Puritan migration arrived. Winthrop noticed, and in a companion passage thanked God for it: the natives, he wrote, had been swept by smallpox "so as the Lord hath cleared our title to what we possess." The fiction of the empty land was laid over a land that disease, not law, had partly emptied.

**The audience.** The English Puritan community itself — a population that needed to understand its own migration as lawful and godly rather than as an armed intrusion upon the sons of Adam. This is the tell of the whole apparatus, visible already at the root: the fiction was built first not to convince the dispossessed but to let the dispossessing community keep its self-image intact while it acted.

# The Promise That Framed the Theft

*The Northwest Ordinance, Article 3 (13 July 1787)*

Two months before the Constitutional Convention finished its work, the Confederation Congress enacted the charter for organising the first federal territory, and wrote into it a promise so categorical that every later instrument in this ledger is, in effect, a way around it:

> "The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and, in their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress..."

**What the words did.** Read forwards, the sentence is an absolute guarantee: no consent, no taking. Read as an instrument, it is something subtler — a promise with a hinge already built into it. The clause *"unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress"* is the hinge. It concedes the entire principle it appears to establish, because it leaves the definition of a "just and lawful war" — and therefore the definition of when consent may be dispensed with — in the hands of the very body doing the taking. The promise was real, and it was self-cancelling, and both facts are the point.

**The floor beneath.** Even as the ink dried, settlers were pouring across the Ohio in advance of any treaty or purchase, and the Northwest Indian War (in which multi-tribal confederations under Little Turtle and Blue Jacket destroyed two U.S. armies before their defeat at Fallen Timbers in 1794) was the direct result. "Utmost good faith" described a policy that the government could not have enforced against its own settlers even had it wished to.

**The audience.** Two at once. To the wider world of the late-eighteenth-century Atlantic, and to the new republic's own conception of itself as a lawful successor to Britain rather than a mere land-grab, the Ordinance said: *we take by consent, not conquest.* To the tribes whose consent it invoked, it said the same thing, and meant it only until the hinge clause made consent unnecessary. That the promise was made at all — that the government felt obliged to write "never... without their consent" into its founding territorial charter — is the revealed-preference evidence: an apparatus with no need of Indigenous consent does not trouble to promise it.

# The Keystone

## *Johnson v. M'Intosh, 21 U.S. 543 (1823)*

Everything downstream rests on one unanimous Supreme Court opinion, written by Chief Justice John Marshall, in a contrived suit between two white claimants to the same Illinois land — one holding title from a 1770s purchase directly from the Piankeshaw, the other from a later federal patent. The question was narrow: could a tribe sell land directly to a private buyer? Marshall's answer required him to build, from the raw materials of European colonial theory, the entire legal architecture of the relationship. The keystone sentence:

> "...discovery gave title to the government by whose subjects, or by whose authority, it was made, against all other European governments, which title might be consummated by possession."

The consequence for Indigenous title he stated with a candour that is itself remarkable:

> "The Indians were admitted to be the rightful occupants of the soil, with a legal as well as just claim to retain possession of it, and to use it according to their own discretion; but their rights to complete sovereignty, as independent nations, were necessarily diminished... by the original fundamental principle that discovery gave exclusive title to those who made it."

**What the words did.** In a single decision it accomplished what took centuries of statute in other colonial systems: it retroactively voided every private purchase of Indigenous land in the nation's history, and it converted the entire continental interior into territory to which the United States, as successor to the British Crown's "discovery," already held ultimate title.

Indigenous nations were left a "right of occupancy" — they could live on the land, use it, refuse to leave — but not the power to sell it to anyone except the federal government. They became, in the working logic of American property law, occupants of land the United States already owned. Every subsequent removal was, in this frame, not a taking but a *clearing* of the sovereign's own estate.

Marshall did not pretend the principle had moral authority he could not supply. He was explicit that it rested on power and on a religious pretext he named as a pretext:

> "...the character and religion of its inhabitants afforded an apology for considering them as a people over whom the superior genius of Europe might claim an ascendency."

An apology — an excuse — not a justification. And he conceded the whole thing might be indefensible, and held that its indefensibility no longer mattered:

> "However extravagant the pretension of converting the discovery of an inhabited country into conquest may appear; if the principle has been asserted in the first instance, and afterwards sustained; if a country has been acquired and held under it; if the property of the great mass of the community originates in it, it becomes the law of the land, and cannot be questioned."

That is the naked mechanism of the robe, stated by its own author: a fiction, asserted, sustained, built upon, becomes unquestionable *because* it has been built upon. The theft launders itself through time.

**The floor beneath.** By 1823 the tribes east of the Mississippi had already lost most of their land base through war, epidemic, and coerced cession; the case did not seize a single acre by itself. What it seized was the *legal ground* — it ensured that no court in the United States would ever again entertain the proposition that a tribe owned its land in a sense the law was bound to respect. It is the quietest and most total instrument in the ledger.

**The audience.** The domestic legal and propertied class — the judges, legislators, land companies, and speculators (a class to which Marshall, who held western land interests, personally belonged) who needed *certainty of title* for the whole edifice of American land ownership to function. This robe was not addressed to the tribes at all. It was addressed to the buyers, and it told them their titles were safe.

# The Machinery of "Choice"

## *The Indian Removal Act (28 May 1830)*

Where *Johnson* supplied the theory, the Removal Act supplied the machine, and it was drafted in the vocabulary of voluntary exchange. Its title announced a transaction between willing parties: "An Act to provide for an exchange of lands with the Indians." Its operative section authorised the President:

> "...to cause so much of any territory belonging to the United States, west of the river Mississippi... to be divided into a suitable number of districts, for the reception of such tribes or nations of Indians as may choose to exchange the lands where they now reside, and remove there..."

And it wrapped the exchange in a guarantee borrowed directly from the language of the Northwest Ordinance — the President was empowered:

> "...solemnly to assure the tribe or nation... that the United States will forever secure and guaranty to them, and their heirs or successors, the country so exchanged with them."

**What the words did.** The single load-bearing word is *choose*. The Act is drafted throughout as an offer, not an order: tribes that "may choose to exchange" would be given western districts and a "solemn" guarantee, "forever," of the new land. Nothing in the text authorises force. The force was supplied by everything around the text — the state jurisdiction laws, the withheld rations, the surveyors already at work, the militias — while the statute itself preserved, on the face of the law, the fiction that removal was a bargain the tribes had elected to make. The word "forever" is the same fiction the Ordinance made and the same one *Lone Wolf* would eventually cancel: a

guarantee of permanence issued by a party that reserved, in practice, the power to revoke it.

**The floor beneath.** The Act passed a bitterly divided Congress — the Senate 28 to 19, the House 102 to 97, among the closest major votes of Jackson's presidency. What "choose to exchange" meant in practice was the Trail of Tears: some 16,000 Cherokee forced west in 1838–39 after a treaty their own government repudiated, with a widely accepted estimate of roughly 4,000 dead of exposure, disease, and starvation, and broader estimates ranging higher. Across all the removals of the 1830s, tens of thousands were moved and many thousands died. "Choice" is the word the statute uses for this.

**The audience.** The domestic public — and especially the substantial Northern, Christian, and Whig opposition that had nearly killed the bill. To be voted for, removal had to be *legible* as something other than expulsion. "Exchange," "choose," "solemnly... forever" were the terms that made a forced march describable, on the floor of Congress, as a generous offer.

# The Robe for the North

## *Andrew Jackson, Second Annual Message to Congress (6 December 1830)*

Seven months after signing the Act, Jackson reported its progress to Congress in the register of humanitarian achievement. This is the America Track in its purest single document — a policy of organised expulsion presented to the domestic audience as benevolence reaching its happy completion:

> "It gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly thirty years, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching to a happy consummation."

The characterisation of the people being removed did the necessary work of making the removal painless to contemplate:

> "It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage hunters."

And the closing move converted the expulsion into an act of rescue — the government saving its wards from a fate it was itself administering:

> "...is it supposed that the wandering savage has a stronger attachment to his home than the settled, civilized Christian?... To save him from this alternative, or perhaps utter annihilation, the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement."

**What the words did.** Three operations at once, each precise. First, "a few savage hunters" and "wandering savage" erased the fact that the Cherokee,

Choctaw, and Creek being removed were settled agriculturalists — the characterisation was not description, it was the necessary premise, because you cannot mourn a wanderer's attachment to a home he supposedly does not have. Second, "benevolent policy" and "kindly offers" relocated the entire question from *is this just?* to *is this not generous?* Third, "to save him from... utter annihilation" cast the government as protector against a violence it was itself producing — the settler pressure that "required" removal was manufactured by the same apparatus now offering removal as the humane escape from it.

**The floor beneath.** The "happy consummation" was, on the ground, the Choctaw removal already under way in lethal winter conditions, and the machinery being assembled for the Creek, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole removals to follow. A U.S. private who served in the Cherokee roundup, John G. Burnett, later wrote that he had "seen men shot to pieces" in the Civil War but that "the Cherokee removal was the cruelest work I ever knew." That is the floor beneath "kindly offers him a new home."

**The audience.** Explicitly the Northern humanitarian and missionary opposition. Jackson's message is not addressed to the tribes and not really to the South, which needed no persuading; it is cut precisely for the constituency that found expulsion morally intolerable, and it offers them a vocabulary — benevolence, protection, generosity — in which they could acquiesce without conceding they were acquiescing in expulsion.

# The Ward and the Guardian

## *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, 30 U.S. 1 (1831)*

When Georgia moved to abolish the Cherokee government outright and seize its land by lottery, the Cherokee — a nation with a written constitution, a bilingual newspaper, and a literacy rate exceeding that of the surrounding white counties — sued in the Supreme Court as a foreign nation seeking an injunction. Marshall closed the courthouse door on a jurisdictional ground that required him to invent a category:

> "...they may, more correctly, perhaps, be denominated domestic dependent nations. They occupy a territory to which we assert a title independent of their will, which must take effect in point of possession when their right of possession ceases. Meanwhile, they are in a state of pupilage. Their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian."

**What the words did.** The invented status — "domestic dependent nation" — placed the tribes in a legal position that appeared in neither the Constitution nor existing law: not a foreign nation (and so denied the protections of international law and the standing to sue), not a state, not a collection of citizens (and so denied constitutional rights). The metaphor of ward and guardian did the rest. It recast the Cherokee's *political* claim — we are a sovereign people whose treaty rights are being violated — as a *dependent's* appeal for better care from a guardian who, being guardian, is the one who decides what the ward's interests require. And the phrase "a title independent of their will, which must take effect in point of possession when their right of possession ceases" wrote the eventual dispossession into the definition of the relationship itself: the United States already held the title; the Cherokee held

only a possession that would end, and when it ended the title would simply "take effect." Marshall wrote their loss into the grammar of who they were.

**The floor beneath.** Even sympathetic, Marshall described what was happening with an accuracy the doctrine otherwise buried: a people "once numerous, powerful, and truly independent... gradually sinking beneath our superior policy, our arts and our arms." The floor here was Georgia's ongoing seizure of Cherokee land by lottery and the extinction of Cherokee self-government within the state's claimed borders — the concrete facts the "ward and guardian" language dressed as protective custody.

**The audience.** The Court's own institutional standing and the constitutional order — Marshall needed a formula that neither admitted a foreign nation inside the republic's borders nor conceded that a people with treaty rights could be stripped by a state. "Domestic dependent nation" served both needs and served the dispossession besides, which is why it, and not the more protective language of the following year, became the load-bearing precedent.

# The Victory That Was Not Enforced

*Worcester v. Georgia, 31 U.S. 515 (1832)*

One year later the Cherokee reached the Court by a different route — the appeal of Samuel Worcester, a missionary jailed by Georgia for living in Cherokee territory without a state licence — and this time they won, completely. Marshall's opinion is the strongest statement of Indigenous sovereignty the Court would produce for a century:

> "The Cherokee nation, then, is a distinct community occupying its own territory, with boundaries accurately described, in which the laws of Georgia can have no force, and which the citizens of Georgia have no right to enter, but with the assent of the Cherokees themselves, or in conformity with treaties, and with the acts of congress."

He went further, and named the discovery doctrine itself as barely comprehensible:

> "It is difficult to comprehend the proposition, that the inhabitants of either quarter of the globe could have rightful original claims of dominion over the inhabitants of the other, or over the lands they occupied."

**What the words did.** On paper, it did everything: it held Georgia's laws unconstitutional, voided Worcester's conviction, and affirmed that the Cherokee governed their own territory where state law "can have no force." Had it been enforced, the removal would have been illegal. It was not enforced. The famous line of presidential defiance — "John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it" — is almost certainly apocryphal,

first appearing in Horace Greeley's history three decades later. What Jackson actually wrote, in a private letter to General John Coffee on 7 April 1832, is colder and more exact:

> "The decision of the supreme court has fell still born, and they find that they cannot coerce Georgia to yield to its mandate."

**What the words did (the deeper mechanism).** *Worcester* is the ledger's clearest demonstration that a legal victory is a robe with no floor beneath it. The Cherokee had standing, counsel, a Supreme Court, and a unanimous ruling in their favour. The formal machinery of accountability worked exactly as designed and produced exactly nothing, because the Court commands no army and the executive that does simply declined to act. A right the enforcing power will not enforce is, in Jackson's own unimprovable word, still-born. The most telling detail is that even the legend of defiance was later invented — the record could not tolerate a President openly spurning the Court, so a public that needed the story got one, thirty years on. The robe covers even the non-enforcement of the robe.

**The floor beneath.** Worcester and his colleague remained in a Georgia prison after the Court ordered them freed. Within three years a minority faction signed the removal treaty; within six the army marched the Cherokee west. The ruling that "the laws of Georgia can have no force" changed the fate of not one Cherokee.

**The audience.** None that mattered to the outcome. And that is itself the finding: an instrument addressed to no one with the power or will to enforce it is, whatever its eloquence, decorative. *Worcester* is where the ledger records a genuine robe of Indigenous sovereignty being issued and, for want of a floor, doing no work at all.

# Consent Manufactured

## *The Treaty of New Echota (29 December 1835)*

With the Court's ruling still-born and Georgia's seizures proceeding, the government secured the one thing the whole apparatus most required: a *document* bearing Cherokee signatures. The Treaty of New Echota ceded all Cherokee land east of the Mississippi. It was signed by a faction of perhaps three to five hundred people. It was never authorised by the Cherokee National Council. The principal chief, John Ross, did not participate. And roughly 16,000 Cherokee — very nearly the entire adult population — signed a petition to the Senate protesting that the signatories had no authority to sign for the nation. The Senate ratified it anyway, by a single vote.

**What the words did.** The treaty converted a military and political operation of forced removal into a legal transaction to which the target population had, on paper, agreed. Its function was not to obtain consent but to *manufacture the document of consent* — to let the government describe the expulsion as the enforcement of a bargain the Cherokee themselves had made. That the "Cherokee" who made it were an unauthorised minority repudiated by their own nation was available information, entered in the Congressional record in the form of the 16,000-signature petition. It changed nothing, because the treaty's value lay in its existence as a signed instrument, not in the reality of the consent it recited.

**The audience.** The domestic and legal public, for whom "a ratified treaty of cession" was a category that closed the question. The manufactured signature is the same move made across some 400 treaties between 1778 and 1871: the legal *form* of consent, used to accomplish a transfer that force without consent could not have accomplished with the same domestic legitimacy.

# The Providential Robe

## *John L. O'Sullivan, "Annexation" and "The True Title" (1845)*

By the 1840s the frontier had moved past the point where a courtroom fiction could keep pace, and a different robe — older than any of the legal ones, and cut for a different audience — carried the expansion. In the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, the editor John O'Sullivan gave it its enduring phrase, arguing for the annexation of Texas:

> "...the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions."

**What the words did.** The single most important word is grammatical: *allotted*. Not taken, not conquered, not acquired — allotted, in the passive voice, by a Providence whose allocation preceded and outranked any human decision. The construction removes the actor. There is no one to hold responsible for an allotment God made. The whole apparatus of legal justification — discovery, occupancy, cession — is dissolved into a divine arrangement the domestic audience is asked not to *endorse* but merely to *accept*, the way one accepts weather. And O'Sullivan was strikingly explicit that the providential robe was meant to *replace* the legal ones, which he found tediously inadequate to the scale of the claim. Pressing the Oregon claim that December, he swept the legal fictions aside by name:

> "And that claim is by the right of our manifest destiny to overspread and to possess the whole of the continent which Providence has given us... away, away with all these cobweb tissues of rights of discoveries, settlement, continuity, etc."

**The floor beneath.** In the four years framed by O'Sullivan's phrase, the United States annexed Texas (1845), settled the Oregon boundary (1846), and took roughly 525,000 square miles from Mexico by war (1848) — an enlargement of the national territory by more than half, most of it at the expense of Mexico and of the Indigenous nations, from the Comanche to the Navajo to the peoples of California, who were consulted by no one and whose lands Mexico had claimed but never controlled. The "free development" of the "yearly multiplying millions" was, on the ground, the California catastrophe, in which the Indigenous population fell from perhaps 150,000 in 1848 toward 30,000 within a generation under state-financed militia campaigns and bounty killing.

**The audience.** The expansionist, Protestant, nationalist public — an audience for which neither a papal doctrine of discovery nor a lawyer's theory of occupancy carried any weight, but for which *Providence* was the highest recognised currency of all. This is the ledger's clearest case of one apparatus running two robes in parallel: to the courts and the propertied class, discovery and title; to the electorate and the pulpit, divine allotment. Neither audience was ever made to compare the two, and so neither had occasion to notice that the second robe explicitly threw away the first.

IX

# The Pulverizing Engine

## *The Dawes General Allotment Act (8 February 1887)*

Once armed resistance was broken and the tribes confined to reservations, the final instrument was administrative, and it arrived dressed as reform, philanthropy, and the gift of civilisation. Its title named it as a benefit conferred: "An Act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations." It authorised the President to survey any reservation, break the communal land into individual allotments — 160 acres to a family head — hold each in trust for twenty-five years, and then declare everything left over "surplus," to be sold to white settlers.

Its supporters, and later President Theodore Roosevelt, described its purpose with a candour that needs no gloss. In his first annual message to Congress, 3 December 1901, Roosevelt called it:

> "...a mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass. It acts directly upon the family and the individual."

Senator Dawes himself defined the civilisation the Act was to install as the possession of objects: to be civilised, he said, was to "wear civilized clothes... cultivate the ground, live in houses, ride in Studebaker wagons, send children to school, drink whiskey [and] own property."

**What the words did.** "Allotment in severalty" — the granting of individual title — sounds like empowerment and was engineered as dissolution. Communal ownership was the material foundation of tribal political existence; convert it into individual parcels and each parcel becomes separately alienable, separately taxable, separately lost. The "surplus" mechanism required no one's consent — it was pure arithmetic: count the members, multiply by the allotment size, declare the remainder surplus, open it to settlement. Roosevelt's metaphor is exact and unembarrassed: a *pulveriz-*

*ing engine*, acting "directly upon the family and the individual," designed to break the collective ("the tribal mass") into powder too fine to cohere into a nation again.

**The floor beneath.** The figures are the plainest in the ledger. Tribal landholdings stood at about 138 million acres in 1887. By 1934, when allotment was finally halted, about 48 million remained — roughly 90 million acres lost in forty-seven years, close to two-thirds of the remaining land base, much of what survived being desert. The "civilising" trust period ended, for most allottees, in tax foreclosure and sale to white buyers who had, in the words of one account of the process, been "literally waiting in line for the land to go into forfeiture."

**The audience.** Two audiences, and the second is the analytically important one. To the land-hungry West, the Act was the release of "surplus" acreage. But to the Eastern reform community — the "Friends of the Indian," sincere philanthropists genuinely appalled by the treaty violations they had themselves documented — it was addressed as *rescue*: private property would civilise and save the Indian. That the reformers' own prescription, drawn from the same civilisational framework that had justified the dispossession, produced the single most efficient transfer of Indigenous land in the nation's history is the ledger's sharpest lesson about robes. The most effective legitimating fiction is not the cynical one. It is the one the reformers believe.

X

# The Academic Robe

## *Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" (1893)*

The same year the Census declared the frontier closed, a young historian read a paper to the American Historical Association, at the Chicago World's Fair, that would organise how educated Americans understood their own history for the next sixty years. Its thesis opened:

> "The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development."

And it located the frontier, in a phrase that did quiet and total work:

> "...the frontier is the outer edge of the wave — the meeting point between savagery and civilization."

**What the words did.** The load-bearing word is *free* — "an area of free land." The land was "free" only in the specific sense that the prior inhabitants' claims to it were not cognisable within the analytical frame Turner was building; the dispossession that emptied it appears in his thesis not as event but as landscape, the "savagery" against which "civilization" defined itself. This is a robe of a distinct kind, and the most durable in the ledger, because it operates in the register not of politics or law but of *scholarship*. A government message is understood as advocacy and invites rebuttal; an academic thesis is understood as analysis and carries the authority of a discipline. When the vocabulary of the governing narrative becomes the vocabulary of the field that studies the nation's past, the fiction is no longer a claim to be argued but a category through which all evidence is thereafter processed. Turner did not

defend the conquest. He made it disappear into "free land," and taught a profession to see it that way.

**The floor beneath.** "Free land" was the 175 million-plus acres granted to the railroads, the 270 million-plus claimed under the Homestead Act, and the reservation "surplus" opened by allotment — every acre of it Indigenous territory, appropriated and then re-described as the vacant stage on which American democratic character was formed. The Census line Turner built on ("the frontier of settlement… can hardly be said to be a frontier line") marked not an emptiness filled but a dispossession completed.

**The audience.** The educated domestic public and the historical profession itself — the audience whose framework for understanding the national story would, in turn, shape the schoolbooks, the popular histories, and the political common sense of generations. Turner's robe is the one that made the others invisible, by absorbing the whole violent sequence into the neutral, even heroic, language of "development."

XI

# The Fiction Completed

## *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock, 187 U.S. 553 (1903)*

The last instrument closed the one gap the others had left open. Treaties still, in theory, required the tribes' consent to cede land — the Medicine Lodge Treaty of 1867 expressly provided that no further cession of the Kiowa-Comanche reservation would be valid without the signatures of three-fourths of the adult men. Congress allotted the reservation anyway, on an agreement whose required signatures had not been obtained (and, it was alleged, had in part been forged). When the Kiowa chief Lone Wolf sued, a unanimous Supreme Court held that none of it mattered:

> "Plenary authority over the tribal relations of the Indians has been exercised by Congress from the beginning, and the power has always been deemed a political one, not subject to be controlled by the judicial department of the government."

The Court then declined even to examine the alleged fraud in obtaining the signatures, holding the entire matter to be "solely within the domain of the legislative authority," and reassured itself as to the consequences:

> "It is to be presumed that in this matter the United States would be governed by such considerations of justice as would control a Christian people in their treatment of an ignorant and dependent race."

**What the words did.** It completed the fiction by removing its last conditional. From *Johnson*, the United States held ultimate title; from *Cherokee Nation*, the tribes were wards in pupilage; from the treaty system, cession still nominally required consent. *Lone Wolf* held that Congress possessed *plenary* — complete, and judicially unreviewable — power over tribal land, and could therefore abrogate any treaty guarantee at will, without consent, and the

courts could not inquire into its motives or even into whether the required signatures were real. The "solemn... forever" guarantees of the Removal Act and of four hundred treaties were, as of 1903, formally revocable by unilateral act of Congress. And the closing sentence retrieved the exact register of *Cherokee Nation* seventy years on — the ward, the guardian, the "ignorant and dependent race" whose protection was left to the presumed good faith of a "Christian people." The guarantee of good faith replaced the guarantee of consent. The circle closed.

**The floor beneath.** Lone Wolf's reservation was allotted immediately, and the "surplus" opened to a rush of non-Indian settlers. The decision cleared the last legal obstacle to the allotment machine's completion of the transfer already under way — the 90 million acres.

**The audience.** The domestic legal order and the Congress itself, to whom the Court handed unreviewable authority; and, in the closing sentence, the domestic conscience, offered the reassurance that unreviewable power would be exercised as "considerations of justice... would control a Christian people." The floor beneath that reassurance was the ninety-million-acre loss it was written to authorise.

# The Fiction Still Standing

The keystone was never removed. *Johnson v. M'Intosh* has never been overturned; the discovery doctrine remains the foundation on which American land title formally rests, and the Supreme Court cited *Johnson* approvingly as recently as *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation* (2005). In March 2023 the Vatican formally repudiated the fifteenth-century papal bulls from which the doctrine of discovery had descended, declaring they were "not part of the teaching of the Catholic Church" — removing the theological foundation while leaving the legal superstructure entirely intact. The excuse Marshall had called "an apology" was withdrawn by the institution that first issued it; the American law built on it stood, and stands, unmoved. A fiction, asserted, sustained, and built upon, becomes — in the Chief Justice's own words — "the law of the land, and cannot be questioned." He was, as a description of what he was doing, exactly right.

# Reading the Ledger Whole

Laid end to end, the instruments do not form a list of separate justifications. They form a single adaptive apparatus, and four features of it become visible only when they are read together.

**The two tracks never converge.** At every stage, what was being *done* and what was being *told* are structurally incompatible, and the incompatibility is not incidental — it is the working principle. The Removal Act says "choose"; the floor is a forced march with thousands dead. Jackson's message says "kindly offers him a new home"; the floor is the roundup a U.S. soldier called the cruelest work he ever knew. Turner says "free land"; the floor is 175 million acres of railroad grants carved from Indigenous territory. The gap is not the apparatus failing to describe reality accurately. The gap is the apparatus working exactly as designed, running one account for the people who had to act and another for the people who had to approve.

**Every robe is cut to an audience, and the apparatus ran several at once.** Discovery and title were addressed to the courts and the propertied class, who needed certainty. Benevolence and rescue were addressed to the Northern conscience, which needed absolution. Providence was addressed to the expansionist electorate, which needed a mandate higher than law. "Free land" was addressed to the historical profession, which needed a neutral vocabulary. Wardship and good faith were addressed to a domestic order handing itself unreviewable power. No single audience was ever positioned to see all the robes at once — and the most striking single fact in the whole ledger is that O'Sullivan's providential robe explicitly *discarded* the legal robe ("away with all these cobweb tissues of rights of discoveries") without cost, because the courtroom audience for discovery and the pulpit audience for Providence were never the same people in the same room.

**The apparatus paid real, avoidable costs for legitimacy it did not militarily need — which is the proof the robes were load-bearing.** The

United States held overwhelming force over these populations for the entire span of the ledger. It did not need consent. And yet it wrote "never without their consent" into the Northwest Ordinance; it argued *Johnson* rather than simply seizing; it negotiated some four hundred treaties; it manufactured the New Echota signatures rather than dispensing with a treaty; it built the "solemn... forever" guarantee into a removal statute; it staged the *Worcester* case at all. Force does not pay for what it does not need. That the apparatus spent so much — legislative time, judicial effort, diplomatic form, the labour of manufacturing consent — to acquire *legal* cover for what its guns had already secured is the whole evidence that the legal cover was necessary: necessary to the domestic audiences whose belief, and whose sense of themselves as a lawful and Christian people, was the cheap foundation on which the expensive machinery of force could rest.

**The most effective fiction was the one the reformers believed.** The cynical robes — the manufactured treaty, the still-born ruling — are easy to see through and did their work briefly. The durable damage came through the sincere ones. The Dawes Act's ninety-million-acre transfer was driven not by cynics but by the "Friends of the Indian," who genuinely believed private property would save the people it in fact dispossessed, and whose sincerity was precisely what made their prescription unstoppable, because it could not be answered as hypocrisy. And Turner's "free land" did the most lasting work of all, not as advocacy anyone could rebut but as scholarship a profession absorbed. A robe is most load-bearing not when it is worn to deceive but when it has been driven so deep by formation that the wearer no longer experiences it as a robe at all — when "free land" is simply what the map showed, and "benevolent policy" is simply what the government was doing, and the theft has become the water everyone swims in.

# The Strongest Case Against This Reading

The discipline requires ending on the best opposing position, stated fairly. It runs as follows. The law did not cause the dispossession; it recognised facts already on the ground. By 1823 the tribes east of the Mississippi had already lost most of their land to war and epidemic; Marshall did not seize an acre. Removal, however brutally executed, may genuinely have been the least-worst option once the settler flood was unstoppable and state governments were determined to extinguish tribal jurisdiction with or without federal sanction — Jackson's "utter annihilation" was not only rhetoric; peoples who remained faced real and lethal settler violence the federal government could not or would not restrain. Allotment was supported by sincere reformers who correctly saw that the reservation system was itself a catastrophe of dependency and poverty, and who reached for private property as the era's best available theory of self-sufficiency. And every complex society requires a settled law of land title to function at all; *Johnson* supplied one, and a nation cannot re-litigate the origin of every acre without dissolving into chaos. On this reading, the "fictions" are not the cause of anything. They are the ordinary legal and rhetorical residue of a demographic and military transformation that would have happened, in substance, whatever words had been used — and to treat the words as the mechanism is to mistake the paperwork for the event.

The reading has real force, and two parts of it should simply be granted. The dispossession was over-determined; the law did not invent the demographic collapse or the settler flood, and no plausible set of words would have reversed them. And the reformers were, many of them, sincere — that is precisely what this ledger has argued, and it is a fact that indicts the framework of sincere belief, not the sincerity of the individuals.

But the objection proves less than it claims, on the ledger's own evidence. First, the words were not idle residue, because the apparatus *spent* to obtain them — and force does not spend on residue. A nation that regarded the legal forms as mere paperwork trailing an inevitable event would not have argued *Johnson*, staged *Worcester*, manufactured New Echota, or troubled to write "forever" into a removal it intended to make permanent by other means. The expenditure demonstrates that the forms were doing necessary work; the necessity was the domestic audience's belief, and belief is not residue but the load-bearing foundation that let the whole structure be held cheaply. Second, "the law only recognised facts on the ground" is exactly Marshall's own argument — a pretension "however extravagant" becomes "the law of the land, and cannot be questioned" once "the property of the great mass of the community originates in it." That is not a neutral description of how title settles; it is the self-laundering mechanism named by its own author, and to repeat it as a defence is to adopt the robe rather than to read it. Third, the "least-worst option" defence measures the choice against a field of options the apparatus itself had narrowed — the settler violence that made removal "humane" was produced and tolerated by the same government that then offered removal as rescue, which is the precise structure of Jackson's message and not an external constraint upon it. The objection, in the end, does not refute the ledger. It restates, in the measured voice of retrospective reasonableness, the last and most durable robe in it: that what was done was, all things considered, what had to be done — the conqueror's syllogism, that order was necessary and therefore *this* order was just. The ledger's whole purpose is to make that syllogism legible as a syllogism, so that its two halves — the real necessity of some settlement, and the particular injustice of the settlement actually chosen — can be held apart and each counted at its true weight, which is what the robe exists to prevent.

# A Note on Sources

Every quotation in this ledger is drawn from the primary instrument named and has been verified against the public record: the Northwest Ordinance (Art. 3) and the Indian Removal Act as enrolled; Winthrop's *General Considerations* (1629) from the Winthrop Papers; *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831), *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832), and *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* (1903) from the United States Reports; Jackson's Second Annual Message (1830) and his letter to John Coffee (1832); O'Sullivan's "Annexation" and "The True Title" (1845); Roosevelt's First Annual Message (1901); and Turner's "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" (1893). The apocryphal Jackson quotation ("now let him enforce it") is flagged as apocryphal in the text, its first appearance being Greeley's 1864 history; the letter to Coffee gives Jackson's documented words. Land and mortality figures are given as ranges where the historical record disagrees. Modern scholarship informing the framing — on the discovery doctrine, on allotment, on the two-audience structure of the expansion — is not quoted here; this ledger's evidence is the instruments themselves, which is where a robe-analysis must always finally rest.

◆